IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA MARTINSBURG

VERNON AUTREY,

Petitioner,

v. CIVIL ACTION NO.: 3:21-CV-70

(GROH)

WARDEN HUDGINS,

Respondent.

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Now before the Court is a Report and Recommendation ("R&R") issued by United States Magistrate Judge Robert W. Trumble. ECF No. 30. Pursuant to the Local Rules, this civil action was referred to Judge Trumble for submission of a proposed R&R. Judge Trumble issued an R&R on April 29, 2022, recommending that the Petitioner's Petition for Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 [ECF No. 1] be denied and dismissed with prejudice.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this Court is required to make a *de novo* review of those portions of the magistrate judge's findings to which objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation to which no objections are addressed. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). Failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of *de novo* review and of the Petitioner's right to appeal this Court's Order. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Snyder v. Ridenour, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989); United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91, 94 (4th Cir. 1984).

Objections to Magistrate Judge Trumble's R&R were due within fourteen plus three

days of the Petitioner being served with a copy of the same. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed.

R. Civ. P. 72(b). Service was accepted by the pro se Petitioner on May 2, 2022. ECF

No. 31. As of the date of this Order, no objections have been filed. Therefore, after

allowing additional time for transit in the mail, the Court finds that the deadline for the

Petitioner to submit objections to the R&R has passed. Accordingly, this Court will review

the R&R for clear error.

Upon careful review of the R&R, it is the opinion of this Court that Magistrate Judge

Trumble's Report and Recommendation [ECF No. 30] should be, and is hereby,

ORDERED ADOPTED for the reasons more fully stated therein. The Petitioner's Petition

[ECF No. 1] is **DENIED** and **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.

It is further **ORDERED** that the Respondent's Motion to Dismiss, or in the

Alternative, for Summary Judgment [ECF No. 19] be **GRANTED**, and that the Petitioner's

Motion for Release to Home Detention [ECF No. 28] be **DENIED**.

The Clerk is **DIRECTED** to **STRIKE** this case from the Court's active docket. The

Clerk of Court is **FURTHER DIRECTED** to mail a copy of this Order to the Petitioner by

certified mail, return receipt requested, at his last known address as reflected on the

docket sheet.

DATED: May 23, 2022

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

2